

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 313 520

CE 053 683

AUTHOR Rohm, Kenneth G., Jr.
TITLE Corrections Education--Is It Effective? An Evaluation.
PUB DATE Jun 89
NOTE 88p.; Master's Thesis, Pennsylvania State University. Dot matrix type throughout. Appended photoreduced student intake forms not reproducible.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Master Theses (042) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Basic Education; Adult Literacy; Adult Students; Blacks; *Correctional Education; Demography; Females; High School Equivalency Programs; Hispanic Americans; *Literacy Education; Males; Mathematics Instruction; *Minority Groups; *Outcomes of Education; Participant Characteristics; *Prisoners; Program Effectiveness; Reading Instruction; *Student Characteristics; Whites

ABSTRACT

Education records of 1,193 inmates who enrolled in a county prison corrections education program in Pennsylvania from January 1981 through December 1988 were used to evaluate the outcomes of the program. The number of years of formal education, education program placement test scores, end of class cycle test scores, student's stated goal or purpose for enrolling, class completion and attendance rates, and outcomes were cross-tabulated and analyzed by the student's race, gender, marital status, and the person or agency who referred the student to the program. Significant differences were found to exist in each of the comparisons. The percentage of racial minorities in both the prison population and the education center population was found to be significantly higher than the overall county population. The years of formal education for the black group were significantly higher than for the other racial groups. Males represented a significantly higher proportion in both the education center's and the prison's population. Females were found to have significantly higher formal education levels. Students who were referred by other inmate students improved significantly in both mathematics and reading, whereas students referred by other sources failed to improve in either subject. Students who were married failed to improve, whereas single and separated students significantly improve in mathematics and/or reading. (Document includes 35 tables, 18 references, and student intake forms.) (KC)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED313520

The Pennsylvania State University
The Graduate School
Capitol College
Behavioral Science Program

CE
Corrections Education - Is It Effective?
An Evaluation.

A Master's Paper in
Psychosocial Science
by

Kenneth G. Rohm Jr.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Master of Psychosocial Science
in Community Psychology

June 1989

© 1989 by Kenneth G. Rohm Jr.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

K. G. Rohm
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CEDS 3683
2
BEST COPY AVAILABLE ✓

Abstract

Education records of 1193 inmates who enrolled in a county prison corrections education program from January 1981 through December 1988 were used to perform this evaluation. The number of years of formal education, education program placement test scores, and of class cycle test scores, student's stated goal or purpose of enrolling, the class completion, attendance rates, and outcomes were cross-tabulated and analyzed by the student's ethnicity, gender, marital status, and the person or agency who referred the student to the program. Significant differences were found to exist in each of the comparisons. The percentage of ethnic minorities in both the prison population and the education center population, was found to be significantly higher than the overall county's population. The years of formal education for the Black group was significantly higher than the other ethnic groups. Males represented a significantly higher proportion in both the education center's and the prison's populations. Females were found to have significantly higher formal education levels. Students who were referred by other inmate students significantly improved in both math and reading, while students referred by other sources failed to improve in both reading and math. Students who were married failed to improve, while single and separated students significantly improved in either math and/or reading.

Table of Contents

	Page
Abstract	iii
List of Tables	vi
Introduction	1
The Problem	1
Corrections Education	3
Background of the Problem	4
Rational for the Study	6
Hypothesis	8
RESEARCH PROCEDURES	10
Subjects	10
Data Collection Instruments	11
Procedure	17
RESULTS	18
Comparison by Ethnic Group	18
Ethnic and Population (18); Formal Education Level and Entry Level (20); Pre and Post Reading and Math Scores (22); Course Attendance and Completion Rates (25); Program Re-Entry (27); Difference Between Pre and Post Scores (29); Stated Goals and Outcomes (31)	
Comparison by Gender	33
Gender and Population (33); Formal Education Level and Entry Level (35); Pre and Post Reading and Math Scores (35); Course Attendance and Completion Rates (36); Program Re-Entry (37); Difference Between Pre and Post Scores (37); Stated Goals and Outcomes (39)	
Comparison by Marital Status	41
Marital Status and Population (41); Formal Education Level and Entry Level (43); Pre and Post Reading and Math Scores (45); Course Attendance and Completion Rates (46); Program Re-Entry (47); Difference Between Pre and Post Scores (48); Stated Goals and Outcomes (50)	
Comparison by Referral Source	52
Referral by Population (52); Formal Education Level and Entry Level (54); Pre and Post Reading and Math Scores (55); Course Attendance and Completion Rates (57); Program Re-Entry (57); Difference Between Pre and Post Scores (58); Stated Goals and Outcomes (60)	
DISCUSSION	62
Comparison by Ethnic Group	62
Comparison by Gender	65
Comparison by Marital Status	66
Comparison by Referral Source	67

	Page
SUMMARY	70
REFERENCES	73
ADDENDUM Ia	75
ADDENDUM Ib	76
ADDENDUM IIa	77
ADDENDUM IIb	78
ADDENDUM IIc	79

List of Tables

Table		Page
1	Ethnic distribution of the gender, age, and special status of inmates	12
2	Ethnic distribution of the education program, of the prison and the county.	19
3	The number of students, means, and standard deviations of the years of formal education level and the entry levels compared by ethnic group	21
4	Comparison of formal education levels and entry levels by ethnicity	21
5	Number of students, means, and standard deviations of the pre and post WRAT scores by ethnic group	23
6	The percents, means and standard deviations for the hourly attendance rates and the cell percents for program outcomes by ethnic group.	26
7	The number of students, mean difference, standard error, t-value, degrees of freedom and the t-probability for the pre and post <u>reading</u> scores compared by ethnic group.	30
8	The number of students, mean difference, standard error, t-value, degrees of freedom, t-probability for the pre and post <u>math</u> scores compared by ethnic group.	30
9	A comparison of stated goals broken down by ethnic groups	32
10	The significant outcomes compared by ethnic group.	32

Table		Page
11	Gender distribution of the education program, of the prison and the county	34
12	Distribution of the proportions of ethnic group, age, and special status of inmates by gender.	34
13	Gender distribution of the formal education levels and entry levels.	35
14	Numbers, means, and standard deviations of the pre and post WRAT scores by gender.	36
15	The numbers, means and standard deviations for the hourly attendance rates and the numbers and percents for program outcomes by gender.	36
16	The number of students, mean difference, standard error, t-value, degrees of freedom, and the t-probability for the pre and post <u>reading</u> scores compared by gender.	38
17	The number of students, mean difference, standard error, t-value, degrees of freedom and the t-probability for the pre and post <u>math</u> scores compared by gender.	38
18	A comparison of stated goals analyzed by gender.	39
19	The significant outcomes compared by gender.	40
20	Marital distribution of the education program and the county.	42
21	Marital status distribution of the formal education levels and entry levels.	44
22	Numbers, means, and standard deviations of the pre and post WRAT scores by marital status.	45

Table		Page
23	The numbers, means and standard deviations for the hourly attendance rates and the numbers and percentages for program outcomes by marital status.	46
24	The number of students, mean difference, standard error, t-value, degrees of freedom, and the t-prob for the pre and post <u>reading</u> scores compared by marital status.	49
25	The number of students, mean difference, standard error, t-value, degrees of freedom, and the t-probability for the pre and post <u>math</u> scores compared by marital status.	49
26	A comparison of stated goals by marital status.	51
27	The significant outcomes compared by marital status.	51
28	The percentages of ethnic group and gender by referral source	57
29	Referral status distribution of the formal education levels and entry levels.	54
30	Numbers, means, and standard deviations of the pre and post WPAT scores by referral source.	56
31	The numbers, means, and standard deviations for the hourly attendance rates and the numbers and percentages for program outcomes by referral source.	57
32	The number of students, mean difference, standard error, t-value, degrees of freedom, and the t-probability for the pre and post <u>reading</u> scores compared by referral source. . .	59

Table		Page
33	The number of students, mean difference, standard error, t-value, degrees of freedom, and the t-probability for the pre and post <u>math</u> scores compared by referral source.	59
34	A comparison of stated goals analyzed by referral source.	61
35	The significant outcomes compared by referral source.	61

CORRECTIONS EDUCATION - Is it Effective?

An Evaluation.

Most people don't know we spend 6.6 million dollars a year to keep 750,000 illiterates in jail. I'm trying to remind people that there's a direct correlation between crime and illiteracy (Bush, Barbara, 1982).

Introduction

The Problem

The alarming statement made by the current First Lady does not stand alone, nor are the figures she cites completely inaccurate or without basis in scientific research. These and other statistics have been partially substantiated by other authors and researchers (Skalka, 1989; Bell, Conrad, & Suppa, 1984).

Skalka (1989) declares that from 60 to 75 percent of prison inmates have not completed high school.

Bell, Conrad, and Suppa (1984), reporting the results of a national study of learning deficiencies in adult inmates, included several relevant findings:

- 1) 58 percent of the 1000 plus inmates surveyed were from minority groups¹.

¹ Included in the minority group category are Hispanics who may not necessarily be undereducated, but are deficient in the English language instead.

- 2) 42 percent of all the inmates participating in the national study were learning deficient².
- 3) 82 percent of the learning deficient inmates were found to be learning disabled (disorders affecting motor or discriminatory skills) as well.
- 4) the adjudication rate for inmates with learning deficiencies (63%) was higher than the rate for inmates without learning deficiencies (56%).
- 5) inmates with learning deficiencies committed slightly more violent crimes.
- 6) the amount of time the inmate spends in contact with the Criminal Justice System is positively correlated with the level of violence of the individual inmate - in other words as contact time increases, the individual's level of violence also increases in subsequent crimes.
- 7) 60 percent of the inmates who participated in the national study had been previously adjudicated as juveniles.
- 8) 73 percent of the inmates came from poor unstable family backgrounds, had little or no work history, and consistently scored five grades lower on the educational placement tests than they had achieved through formal educational systems.

In addition to the increase of violence which prolonged incarceration or repeated re-incarcerations may be related to, Homant (1984) theorizes that

² Inmates scoring less than the fifth grade level on the Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE) were classified as learning deficient.

"prisonization" may occur as well. Clemmer (1940) defines "prisonization" as the "taking on, in a greater or lesser degree, of the folkways, mores, customs, and general culture of the penitentiary." Homant theorizes that prisonization may have a negative effect on parolees: in times of stress the parolee may revert back the assimilated prison behavior and respond to the stress in the prisonized manner. In this manner, Homant speculates, one lengthy incarceration may lead to an increase of re-incarcerations.

It may not be that under-educated Americans commit more crime than the more literate members of society. However, the literature does indicate that as the functional literacy level decreases, the likelihood of being adjudicated and incarcerated increases. In addition, it appears that the inmates with literacy levels below the functional literacy rate tend to be from minority groups, to have committed slightly more violent crimes, and if not intervened with, tend to become more violent as the time of contact with the Criminal Justice System increases.

At first glance, the plight of the undereducated may seem hopeless. Individual cases may exist where the undereducated inmate has been able to reverse the direction of his life by self-help methods, but for the most part these methods do not work. The undereducated inmate may not have the skills necessary or even be inclined to restructure his life. A formal intervention that may assist as many undereducated inmates as possible is needed. Corrections Education may be the most appropriate answer for this problem.

Corrections Education

Corrections Education is an in-prison remedial education program. The program offers English as a Second Language (ESL) and three grade levels of

Adult Basic Education (ABE): 0 to 4, 5 to 8, and 9 to 12. Many of the Corrections Education Centers also offer individual college courses or complete degree programs³. Participation in the educational program is voluntary and, with the exception of the college courses, without cost to the inmate.

Most of the inmates who enroll are referred by another inmate student or agency. In addition, entry into and exiting from the program is in large part determined by institutional constraints. That is, the inmates have no say as to the length of their stay in prison. Certain factors such as release on bail, probation, sentencing, and transferring to another institution all affect the ability of an inmate to successfully complete⁴ the program. However, the inmates who were released on bail and later sentenced to the county prison are able to re-enter the program as often as needed.

Background of the Problem

The concept of in-prison remedial training programs is not new. Roberts (1984) states that circa 1557, the Bridewell House of Corrections, London, England began a skills training program in response to upwards of 12,000 disenfranchised peasants⁵ who had invaded London seeking work. When work was

³ The college courses are usually sponsored by a college or university located in the vicinity of the institution. Oft-times the inmate, with financial aid or by other means, must bear the cost of these courses.

⁴ For the purpose of this research project completion will be defined as remaining with the program until the six month cycle is finished.

⁵ These disenfranchised peasants were the result of the social and economic throes that held England as well as the most of Europe captive during the 1500's. The economic woes were brought about by the transformation from an agricultural feudal economy to an economy based on English Mercantilism - leading to the Enclosure Act which forced large numbers of peasants off their land.

not found these individuals resorted to petty crime to survive, as do some in any large contemporary city.

Roberts (1984) states that the Bridewell experiment was so successful that the Continent (Europe) began to develop similar programs of their own. England, despite the success of their own program, however, decided that it would be less costly to replant their criminal population throughout the Empire - Australia is an example of this methodology - including North America.

In North America (the U.S. and Canada), the development of prison reform including the in-prison training programs began in Philadelphia (a concept of William Penn) and continues today. Roberts (1985), Angle (1982), Gehring & Muth (1985), Muth & Gehring (1986), and Gehring (1982) have documented the successes and failures of the prison reform movements since the Quakers (circa 1787) until the present.

The trail of prison reform, in particular - the in-prison remedial education programs, is laced with success stories. And, for today, these educational programs may be the most appropriate answer for the short-comings and problems faced by the contemporary prison population. From the literature it appears that the same problems exist today as existed in England 400 years ago. That is, it appears that for the most part the undereducated, or not appropriately educated, disenfranchised members of society still fill the inner vacuity of our prisons.

However, even with the glowing appearance, at least on the surface, of doing a good job, Corrections Education programs have not escaped the critical eye or the scathing pen of investigators. Golden & Thomas (1984)

question whether the Corrections Education programs have become merely a visible symbol. These authors advance the notion that in many prisons remedial education programs may exist as an eye-pleaser and in reality have no substance. These authors contend that such a symbolic occurrence may result from the real or perceived need for strict institutional constraints such as lock-downs of students caused by real or imagined fear of escape, unruly behavior from the inmates, or perceptions or beliefs on the part of the controllers that the controlled have committed a crime, are inside for punishment, and do not deserve these educational programs. Although the stated policies of the institution usually include educational programs, the real or perceived need or attitude of the prison staff is in reality able to subvert the effectiveness of the educational program without an overt change of policy. The result may be a corrections education instructor with no one to instruct.

Rational for the Study

With these thoughts and research findings in mind, the goal of this research project is to perform an in-depth analysis of a Corrections Education program. Since the bulk of the research findings are concerned with the problems of inmates compared by ethnic group membership, this analysis will also focus on the involvement and effectiveness of the educational program across ethnic groups. The program will also be analyzed across the gender and marital status of the student. The last analysis will investigate the referral source of the students to the program.

The stated goal of this project will be to investigate in the following:

1) Evaluate the ethnic distribution of inmates who enroll in the education program. Do more of one ethnic group join than the others, or are the enrollers distributed in equal proportions across the ethnic groups.

2) Compare the ethnic distribution of the students with the ethnic distributions of the prison and of the county.

3) Evaluate the levels of formal education inmates had prior to being incarcerated, which will be compared by ethnic group.

4) Corrections education program entry levels as determined by placement tests will be compared by ethnic group in terms of the following educational programs: ESL, 0-4, 5-8, or 9-12.

5) Compare the student's formal education level with the program's entry level as determined by the results of the student's placement test.

6) Scores of the placement tests (given at the beginning and at the end of a six month class cycle) for reading and math will be compared by ethnic group. The beginning and the ending test results will be evaluated separately by ethnic groups.

7) Student attendance rates and course completion rates will be compared by the ethnic group.

8) The non-completers will be evaluated to determine whether any re-entered the program at a later time, and if so to determine whether or not the student completed.

9) The scores of the tests for reading and math used to place the student initially will be used to rate efficacy of the education program by retesting the student after a class cycle of 6 months is completed.

The results will be compared by ethnic group distribution.

10) Determine whether the stating of a goal (i.e. improve basic skills, get GED, etc.) had an effect on the success or failure of the student.

The ten areas of evaluation listed above will also be compared by gender and marital status. The last eight will be compared by referral source.

Hypotheses

The predictions for this project are:

1) Ethnic participation in the education program will be a reflection of the prison's population - that is the ethnic group proportion of the students will equal the ethnic proportion of the prison.

2) The comparison of both the inmate student and inmate overall ethnic distributions with the county's ethnic distribution will reflect a significantly larger percentage of minority group members incarcerated.

3) The average formal education levels of the overall prison population will be significantly different from that of adults in the county population, with the minority group achieving the significantly lower mean than the white ethnic group.

4) The entry levels as determined by the placement tests will have a significantly larger number of minority group students in the ESL, 0 - 4 and 5 - 8 entry levels.

5) The scores of the placement tests taken at the beginning of the cycle will be significantly different, with the minority students scoring the lowest scores for both reading and math.

6) The scores of the placement tests taken at the end of the cycle will be significantly different, with the minority students achieving the lower scores for both reading and math.

7) The educational program attendance rates and completion rates will be higher for non-minority groups.

8) Students who have not completed the program once and re-enter will eventually complete.

9) Students who re-entered the program will be representative of the student and the prison's ethnic distribution.

10) Academic improvement for both reading and math will reflect improvement for all ethnic groups. However, only a small significant improvement will occur in the non-minority group.

11) The stated goals will in large part significantly affect the students' eventual outcome.

Although nothing was discovered in the literature to support the predictions for the gender, marital status and referral source, they are as follows: 12) for gender - the prediction for all the points of comparison is that no significant difference will be found between males and females, 13) for marital status - married inmates will do significantly better in both reading and math than the other marital status groups, and 14) for referral source - inmates referred by professionals or agencies will have significantly more improvement than inmates referred by other inmate students.

RESEARCH PROCEDURES

Subjects

The education records of 1193 inmates who participated in the Dauphin County Prison's Corrections Education program were used to complete this project (see table 1). All of the records used were from inmates who had enrolled in the corrections education system. Consent forms were required only from those inmates in the two class cycles which occurred in 1968. None of the inmates received any payment or compensation of any type for their participation in the project.

Included on the table is a variable called special status. This status reflects any special differences an inmate may have. Within this variable are such differences as students who have previously had or currently have mental health/mental retardation problems, students who are immigrants, students who also serve as volunteers working with the education facility, or students who have been previously determined, by subjective report or objective analysis, to be learning disabled.

Included in the total 1193 inmate educational records are the records of 239 inmates who have entered the education facility two or more times. One hundred seventy five (88 black, 41 hispanic, 33 anglo and 13 missing) entered the program a second time. Fifty of the records were from inmates (30 black, 11 hispanic, 8 anglo and 1 missing) who had entered the program three times. Fourteen of the records were from inmates (8 black, 3 hispanic, 2 anglo and 1 missing) who had entered the program four or more times. Two inmates had entered the program at least six times.

Data Collection Instruments

The pre and post reading and math scores were ascertained using the Wide Range Achievement Test - Revised (WRAT-R). The WRAT-R is a standardized non - timed exam that may be administered to individuals or groups. The WRAT-R is used to determine academic achievement levels from age 5 to adult. The WRAT-R was standardized employing a nation-wide stratified sample procedure.

The remaining information needed for this project was collected from a standardized agency intake sheet. The intake sheet is produced by the Pennsylvania Department of Education. This form is multi-copied and consists of two parts. One part is for the incoming-student to complete. This part includes such information as ethnic group, age, marital status, previous formal education, etc. The second part is on the reverse sides of the multi-copies. This part is to be completed by the instructor and the program director. This part includes such information as attendance rates, whether the student completed the program or not, amount and type of progress made, any significant achievements such as passing the GED, etc. (See attached Addenda Ia and Ib - a copy of the instructions sheet for the intake form. And, Addenda IIa, IIb, and IIc - a copy of the intake sheet.)

Table 1 Ethnic distribution of the gender, age, and special status of inmates.

<u>Ethnic Group</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Gender</u>		<u>Age</u>		<u>Special Status</u>				
		<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>Immi-grant</u>	<u>Learning disabled</u>	<u>mh/mr</u>	<u>Volun-teeer</u>	<u>None</u>
Black	521	393	128	25.0	7.3	16	13	1	4	444
Hispanic	192	184	8	25.8	6.7	99	1	1	1	68
Anglo	298	242	56	24.6	6.5	8	10	4	3	246
Missing ⁴	182	127	52	23.7	5.8	1	0	1	1	13
Totals=	1193	946	244	25.1	6.9	124	24	7	9	770
(n=per var)		(n=1190)		(n=1163)			(n=935)			
(unk=per var) ⁷		(unk= 3)		(unk=30)			(unk=258)			

⁴ This table entry is used to indicate the student's whose ethnic group information was unavailable. Also included in this category are one American Indian and two Asians.

⁷ This entry is used to note the number of students for which the tabled information was not available (for example: for the variable "age" the (n=1163) and the (unk=30) means that for thirty students the age was not available.

Procedure

The agency records search yielded seven years of past classes (Jan. 1981 to Dec. 1987). The records were searched for the data needed. The data were also collected from the two cycles that started and ended in 1988. The data were collected, codified, and computerized for statistical analysis. The SPSSX (1986) computer package was used.

The preliminary analysis consisted of organizing and tabulating the descriptive data according to the order stated in the hypothesis and to determine what statistical procedure to use to analyze the comparisons.

The ethnic distribution of the inmate population enrolling in the remedial education program is the first variable of comparison from the stated hypothesis list. To accomplish this analysis, the data were condensed into four groups: Blacks, Hispanic, Anglo and Missing. The resulting ethnic group proportions were then compared with the prison's ethnic group distribution taken from the most recent monthly prison population report (Kelly, 1989) and with county's ethnic populations from the most recent county census (Pennsylvania State Data Center, 1980).

The next area organized and tabled for analysis consisted of the entry level and formal education level of the students. To accomplish this analysis, the students' formal education levels were compared by ethnic group. Next, the entry levels were compared by ethnic group. And finally, the formal education level was condensed into three groups: 0 - 4, 5 - 8 and 9-12. These results were compared with the same three categories in the entry levels (the ESL students were not included in this analysis). The analysis of the formal education level and entry level were compared by ethnic group.

The next procedure includes the pre and the post reading and math scores. The post measures that were collected from the agency's record file were not always originally used as post or end of cycle exams. In some cases, these end of cycle exams were given. However, in other cases they were not. In the cases where no after cycle exam was available and the individual showed up later in the records review or the hands on cycles, the individual's pre or placement test was used for the post-exam score of the earlier cycle. The post test scores collected from the two class cycles that completed during 1988 were administered as post tests for this project.

The pre-test scores used have not been altered or added to in any way. However, many of the pre-tests from the records search are missing. For the Hispanics, many of the students were ESL and, apparently, the placement test was not given. For the other inmates with missing scores, the pre-test scores were not available. The pre-tests from the 1988 participants are more complete. The pre-WRATs for the 1988 groups were not only taken for placement but as a pre-test for this research project as well.

The pre and post WRAT scores were collected from the two sources of data (record review and the 1988 groups). The raw scores were converted to a school grade equivalency ratings and the equivalencies were entered in the computer. The raw score transformation were made using a standardized chart provided with the WRAT..

The base numbers, means, and standard deviations of the pre and post reading and math tests were collected and tabled according to ethnic groupings. The pre-reading and math scores were compared by ethnic group. The post-reading and math scores were also compared by ethnic groups. The

pre-tests and the post-tests were compared at the same time to measure improvement and the results were compared by ethnic group.

The next area of discussion is the program completion rate. Included in the completion rate variable is the drop-rate, attendance rates, goal statements, and significant completion rates.

The drop-out variable consisted of counting three types of program outcomes: 1) completing the program, 2) went on -these individuals not only completed the program but continued in the education program at a higher grade level, and 3) non-completers - this group included those students who for reasons out of their control (parole, bail, sentenced and transferred) were not able to complete, and the students who dropped out because of reasons of their own. The category of "completing the program" was made up of those inmates who remained in the program until the end of the six month cycle^a. The "went on" category consists of students who were advanced through the Corrections Education program. The "non-completers" included those enrollers who had not been sentenced at the time of enrollment, but who were sentenced and transferred to another prison before the cycle was finished. This category also includes individuals who were paroled or otherwise released prior to the end of the class cycle and voluntary drops: students whom, the instructor, on the reverse side of the intake sheet, deemed as a drop and students who the instructor suspended from the class. This category was not used for those students with the completion data unavailable. Inmates with incomplete completion data were coded as missing.

^a The completion category does not attempt to include any measure of academic improvement. It merely counts those inmates that regularly attended class.

Completion/drop rates were tabled according to ethnic groups. The records of the students deemed as non-completers were investigated to determine whether any of these students reentered the program at a later time and, if they did re-enter, what was their final outcome. Did they complete or what?

The attendance rates were, in some cases, written on the intake sheet in the number of days, and on others, the number of hours a student attended class. The daily rates were converted into hours. Again, if the rate was unavailable the attendance rate of that student's record was coded as missing. The attendance rate was tabled for comparison by ethnic group.

On the intake sheet, the part the student initially completes, is a list of goals (see addenda Ia, Ib, and Ic). The most frequently listed goals were tabled for comparison by ethnic group.

The final variable considered is the significant completion rate. This variable included any significant improvement or outcome on the part of the student. The data for this variable were collected from the reverse side of the intake sheet - the part completed by the instructor. This variable included the following: "none" - if the instructor felt no improvement had been made; "improved" - if improvement had been made; "went on" - if the student completed one level of the educational program and continued on to another; "taken GED" - if the GED was taken and failed or if the scores were not back by the completion of the intake sheet; and "passed GED". The resulting data were tabled by ethnic group for additional comparison.

The above listed analyses were repeated a second time. This time, however, the 1193 educational records were condensed into three groups: male, female and missing for the students whose gender was unknown.

Analyses were also conducted by marital status. To conduct these analyses, the marital status categories listed on the intake sheet (see addenda Ia and Ib) were condensed into three groups single, married and separated⁹.

A missing category was included to account for the students whose marital information was not available. The marital status of the general prison population was not included in this series of analyses, only the county's population demographics for marital status.

The last series of analyses consisted of "who referred the student to the education program" taken from the intake sheets (see addenda Ia and Ib). An initial analysis indicated that thirteen referral sources were given. These thirteen were condensed as follows: "peers" - this category is made up of other students; "acquaintance" - this includes family and friends; "work" - includes employer and union; "professional" - includes school counselor and/or clergy; "agencies" - this category includes local education boards, prison personnel and human service agencies; "media" - includes public media sources such as television or radio and mailing campaigns; "other" - this category is the same other listed on the intake sheet; and "missing" - this category is used to include those students who either failed to answer this question or whose responses were lost.

The referral source variable was then used as an independent variable to conduct the analyses on the formal education, entry level, pre-tests and post-tests, completion and attendance rates, and significant completions.

⁹ This category included those students who indicated they were divorced and/or widowed.

RESULTS

Comparison by Ethnic Group**Ethnic and Population**

The results of the ethnic comparison of the inmates enrolled in the education program with the overall prison population do not support the notion that the two populations are equal in ethnic distribution. The Anglo group constituted 39% of the overall population while only 29% of the students enrolled in the corrections education program in the past eight years were Anglo. The Hispanic group, on the other hand, constituted only 9% of the prison population and 19% of the student population.

The results of the ethnic comparison of the overall prison population with the county population do indicate that the two minority groups do make up a larger proportion of the prison population than of the county population. The minority groups constitute approximately 15% of the county population and 61% of the prison population.

A Chi-square was performed on the ethnic distributions of the education center, the prison, and the county. The results, χ^2 (d.f. 5) = 14.6, $p < .05$, indicated a significant difference between the three ethnic distributions. (see table 2.)

Table 2 Ethnic distribution of the education program, of the prison and the county.

<u>Ethnic Group</u>	<u>Percent Students</u>	<u>Percent Prison Population</u>	<u>Percent County Population</u>
Black	52	52	13
Anglo	29	39	85
<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>2</u>
Totals* = 1011		489**	231,673***

* One hundred eighty two of the students were included in the missing category. These inmates are not included in the ethnic comparisons.

** Source: Kelly (1989).

*** Source: Pennsylvania State Data Center, (1980).

Formal Education Level and Entry Level

The formal education levels and the remedial education program entry levels were compared by ethnic group. The results of the tabled data (see table 3) indicated that the formal education for the black group averaged a grade level of 10.1 with 423 (87%) of the members of this group achieving a program entry level of 5-8 or above. This compares with a mean of 9.8 and 9.9 mean years of education for Anglos and Hispanics respectively.

An One-way Analysis of Variance was conducted on the years of formal education across the four levels of the ethnic group variable. The results, $F(3,1064) = 18.63$, $p < .00001$, indicated that a significant difference had occurred. A Student-Newman-Keuls (SNK) procedure was used to probe the ANOVA results for the location of the significance. The Student-Newman-Keuls indicated that the mean years of formal education for the Hispanic group was significantly lower than the other three ethnic groupings. The mean years of formal education for Anglo group was significantly lower than the Black and the Missing ethnic categories. The difference between the means of the Black and Missing groups was also significant with the Missing group having the larger mean.

The formal education levels (the completed grade level reported by the student on the in-take form) were recoded into three groups (0-4, 5-8 and 9-12) to match the three levels (the ESL group is not included) of the program's entry levels as determined by the results of the placement test scores. A "Crosstabs" procedure was performed on the formal education levels and the entry levels. The resulting percentages were tabulated by ethnic group, formal education level and entry level. (See table 4.)

Table 3 The number of students, means, and standard deviations of the years of formal education level and the entry levels compared by ethnic group.

Ethnic Group	Years Formal Education			Entry Level Percents				Ethnic Totals
	Number	Mean	S.D.	ESL	0 - 4	5 - 8	9 - 12	
Black	485	10.1	1.5	*	15	49	36	495
Anglo	284	9.8	1.6	0	11	42	47	284
Hispanic	178	9.9	1.8	52	17	20	11	186
Missing	121	10.5	1.7	7	21	28	44	29
Totals =	1068	9.9	1.8	102	140	407	345	994

(n=per var)

(n=1068)

(n=994)

(unk=per var)

(unk=125)

(unk=199)

* Indicates a percentage less than 1.

Table 4 Comparison of formal education levels and entry levels by ethnicity.

Ethnic Group	Percent Formal Education			Entry Level Percents		
	0 - 4	5 - 8	9 - 12	0 - 4	5 - 8	9 - 12
Black	0	11	89	14	50	36
Anglo	0	16	84	11	42	47
Hispanic	3	27	70	37	41	22
Missing	3	7	90	19	29	52
Totals =	8	114	712	140	407	345
(n=per var)		(n=834)			(n=892)	

The tabulated data indicates that a difference exists between the formal education levels and the program entry levels: eight students indicated a formal education level of "0-4" while 140 were placed into this level as a result of the placement tests.

All of the ethnic categories were substantially reduced between the formal education level and the entry level in the "9-12" grade category. A look at the overall distribution of formal education levels to entry levels show that 712 students (85%) had achieved a formal education level of from grades 9 thru 12, however, only 345 students (39%) achieved the same grade level on the placement test. This is a reduction of 46%.

Pre and Post Reading and Math Scores

The mean scores for the reading (pre and post) and the math (pre and post) were compiled and tabulated by ethnic group. (See table 5.)

A Two-tailed One-way Analysis of Variance was conducted on the mean pre-read, pre-math, post-read, and post-math scores across the collapsed ethnic groups to determine whether any significant differences existed between either the pre-reading or math and the post-reading or math when compared by ethnic group.

The Student-Newman-Keuls (SNK) procedure was employed to probe the ANOVAs for the location of significant differences in scores between ethnic groups. The Student-Newman-Keuls error level was set at the $p < .05$ level.

The results of the One-way Analysis of Variance indicated a significant difference existed between the ethnic groups on all four of the test scores.

Table 5 Number of students, means, and standard deviations of the pre and post WRAT grade scores by ethnic group.

		READING						MATH					
Ethnic		PRE-READ			POST-READ			PRE-MATH			POST-MATH		
Group	N	%	Mean	S.D.	%	Mean	S.D.	%	Mean	S.D.	%	Mean	S.D.
Black	521	80	6.96	1.9	23	7.24	1.8	80	5.53	1.8	23	5.71	1.7
Anglo	298	78	7.51	1.9	15	7.41	1.8	79	6.63	2.0	15	6.39	2.1
Hispa	192	43	6.10	2.8	18	6.28	2.4	50	4.78	1.6	19	5.00	1.5
Missi	182	88	6.95	2.2	16	8.08	1.4	93	5.42	2.0	16	5.90	2.0
Total	1193	75			77			19			19		

The results of the ANOVA analysis of the pre and post-wrat grade scores indicate the following significant differences between the ethnic groups:

PREREAD - F ratio = 10.51, d.f.=(3,885), Fprob.=.0001, $p < .01$;

PREMATH - F ratio = 30.08, d.f.=(3,913), Fprob.=.0001, $p < .01$;

POSTREAD -F ratio = 5.11, d.f.=(3,224), Fprob.=.0019, $p < .01$;

POSTMATH -F ratio = 3.93, d.f.=(3,227), Fprob.=.0093, $p < .01$.

The mean PREREAD scores indicated that a significant difference existed when the scores were compared by ethnic group. The Student - Newman - Keuls procedure indicated that the significance occurred between the ethnic groups PREREAD scores as follows: the mean of the Hispanic PREREAD scores were significantly lower than the mean PREREAD scores of the other three groups, and the mean PREREAD scores of the Anglo group, in addition to being higher than the Hispanic group, were also significantly higher than the PREREAD scores of the other two groups. There was no significant difference between mean PREREAD scores of the Missing and the Black ethnic groupings.

The results of the analysis of the means for PREMATH scores indicated that these mean scores were also significantly different. The Student - Newman - Keuls procedure located the significance between the means of the following ethnic groups: the mean score of the Hispanic group was significantly less than the other three group means, and mean of the Anglo group was significantly higher than the both the Missing and the Black ethnic groups. The means of these two were not significantly different.

The results of the ANOVA on the POSTREAD means by ethnic group indicated a significant difference $p < .05$. The Student - Newman - Keuls procedure located the occurrence of the significance between the mean of the Hispanic group and the other three. The Hispanic group's mean of 6.28 was significantly less than the other three. The Student - Newman - Keuls procedure did not show any significance between the means of the other groups.

The POSTMATH scores also achieved a significant difference between the ethnic groups. The Student - Newman - Keuls revealed that the significance

occurred between the mean scores of the Anglo and Black groups and the mean of the Hispanic and Missing groups. The Hispanic and the Missing groups were significantly lower in the POSTMATH scores than the other groups. No significance was indicated among the POSTMATH means of the other ethnic group variables.

A perfunctory glance at the pre and post-means displayed in table 5 seem to indicate that the possible degree of improvement might also be significant for the Black group - both reading and math, the Anglo group appears to have lost ground - both the math and reading post-means are possibly significantly lower than the pre-means, the Hispanic group appears to have improved in both reading and math and the missing group appears to have significantly improved in reading and possibly math. A more in-depth analysis will be performed later to determine whether the observed differences between the pre and post means are statistically significant when compared by the student's ethnic group.

Course Attendance and Completion Rates

The next area of analysis focused on the course attendance and completion rates. A One-way Analysis of Variance was conducted to compare the hourly attendance rates by ethnic group. The "missing" group is omitted from this analysis because none of the members of this group had the attendance data available.

A Chi-Square was used to compare the three levels of course completion (completed, went on and dropped). The three levels were tabulated and compared by ethnic group. (See table 6 for the ANOVA and Crosstabs results.)

Table 6 The percents, means and standard deviations for the hourly attendance rates and the cell percents for program outcomes by ethnic group.

Ethnic Group	Hourly Attendance Rates			Percent Course Outcomes		
	Percent	Means	S.D.	Completed	Went on	Dropped
Black	50	53.54	56.6	18	19	63
Anglo	27	56.81	48.8	31	8	61
Hispanic	<u>23</u>	<u>82.83</u>	<u>73.2</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>64</u>
Totals =	524			112	87	330

The results of the ANOVA indicated that a significant difference, $F(3,520) = 7.3519$, $p < .01$, had occurred when the hourly attendance rates were compared by ethnic group. A Student - Newman - Keuls was used to probe the ANOVA results. The Student - Newman - Keuls probe indicated that the Hispanic group had a significantly higher hourly attendance rate than either the Black or the Anglo groups. The means of hourly attendance rates were not significantly different for the remaining of the ethnic combinations.

The resulting percentages of the Crosstabs indicated a large percentage (over 60%) of drops for each ethnic group. The Chi-Square, χ^2 (d.f. 9) = 21.69, $p < .01$, indicated a significant difference had occurred between the expected and the obtained frequencies in the course completion variable. The observed frequencies of the "dropped" category was significantly higher than the expected cell frequencies.

Program Re-Entry

All of the ethnic groups had a "dropped" category of greater than 60%. Although this percentage may appear high, it may not represent the exact picture. The "dropped" category included those students who through no fault of their own (parole, bail, or otherwise constrained from completing the program) had to drop. Additional analysis of these drops reflects that 81 (25%) of the students re-entered the program at least once.

The additional analysis consisted of determining how many re-entered the program; if they re-entered, what was their outcome and how many times did they re-enter?

A "Crosstabs" procedure was conducted to determine the whether any re-entries were made.

The results indicate that 81 (49 Black, 18 Hispanic and 14 Anglo) had re-entered the program at least one time: 46 non-completers (29 Black, 9 Anglo, and 8 Hispanic) re-entered the program one time, 30 non-completers (16 Black, 9 Hispanic and 5 Anglo) re-entered the program twice and 5 non-completers (4 Black and 1 Hispanic) re-entered the program three or more times.

The program outcomes for the non-completers who re-entered the program once consisted of 23 (13 Black, 5 Anglo and 5 Hispanic) students who completed and were noted to have shown improvement, one Black student who completed and had taken the GED (the results of the GED were not obtainable from the education center's records), 1 Anglo student who completed and passed the GED, and 2 Hispanics who completed and went on to a higher grade. The remaining 19 (41%) failed to complete.

The outcomes for the group of students who re-entered the program twice included 8 (3 Black, 3 Anglo and 2 Hispanic) students who completed and noted as "improved" and 1 Black student who completed and went on. The remaining 21 students who re-entered the program two times failed to complete.

The outcomes for the five students who re-entered the program three or more times included one Black student who completed and was noted as improved and four students (3 Black and 1 Hispanic) who failed to complete.

The "Crosstabs" results indicated that overall 45% of the students who re-enter the program one or more times do complete. However, as the number of re-entries increases, the proportion of completers decreases. In other words, 59% of the students who re-entered the program once completed, 30% of the students who re-entered the program twice completed and 20% of the

students who re-entered the program three or more times completed. More than half of the students who re-entered one time completed while one-fifth of the students who re-entered three or more times completed.

Difference Between Pre and Post-Scores

The pre-test and post-test scores were tested for significance while controlling for the ethnic group of the subject. One-tailed paired t-tests were used to evaluate the difference between the pre-test and post-test measures.

Although all of the mean differences were positive, indicating that the POSTREAD scores were higher than the PREREAD scores for each ethnic group. Only the Missing and Black groups achieved a significant improvement $p < .05$. The Hispanic group showed improvement to the $p < .064$ level - not quite achieving the $p < .05$ sought for. (See table 7.)

The means of the pre and post math scores were tested in the same manner. One-tailed paired t-tests were used to measure the difference between the pre-test and post-test means.

Although all of the ethnic groups have post-test means higher than the pre-test means, the results of the t-tests indicate that only the Anglo group achieved a POSTMATH mean significantly higher than the PREMATH mean.

(See table 8.)

Table 7 The number of students, mean difference, standard error, t-value, degrees of freedom and the t-probability for the pre and post reading scores compared by ethnic group.

<u>Ethnic Group</u>	<u>Number Students</u>	<u>(Difference) Mean</u>	<u>Standard Error</u>	<u>t Value</u>	<u>d.f.</u>	<u>t Prob</u>
Black	110	0.3126	0.125	-2.51	110	.007*
Anglo	40	0.1425	0.182	-0.78	39	.220
Hispanic	23	0.7040	0.443	-1.59	20	.064
<u>Missing</u>	<u>17</u>	0.7278	0.335	-2.17	17	.023*
Totals =	190					

* indicates a significance < .05

Table 8 The number of students, mean difference, standard error, t-value, degrees of freedom, t-probability for the pre and post math scores compared by ethnic group.

<u>Ethnic Group</u>	<u>Number Students</u>	<u>(Difference) Mean</u>	<u>Standard Error</u>	<u>t Value</u>	<u>d.f.</u>	<u>t Prob</u>
Black	111	0.1036	0.126	-0.82	111	.207
Anglo	42	0.5195	0.190	-2.74	40	.005*
Hispanic	26	0.2039	0.265	-0.77	25	.225
<u>Missing</u>	<u>20</u>	0.2950	0.257	-1.15	19	.133
Totals =	199					

* indicates an achieved significance < .05

Stated Goals and Outcomes

The stated goals were compared by ethnic grouping. The results of the frequency distribution indicated that 65.2% of all the students whose data were available initially enrolled to obtain their diploma (see table 9).

The next highest cited reason for enrolling in the education program was to improve basic skills (11.2%).

The significant outcomes were tabulated by ethnic grouping. A frequency distribution was performed. The results indicate that although 65.2% of the students enrolling did so to obtain their GED diploma, only 14.1% had passed the GED and obtained their diploma. An additional 4.8% had taken the GED test, but were awaiting the results when the reverse side of the intake sheet was completed and filed. The GED outcome for these students was not available. (see table 10.)

This comparison does, however, reflect an encouraging note. That is, in addition to those taking and passing the GED, 41.8% of the students were rated as improved by the instructor, and 6.7% of the students went on.

The frequency distribution of significant completions might have been higher if the data for 592 (49.6%) students had been known. If the assumption that the distribution of the Missing group is approximately representative, then the overall significant completion rate would increase.

Table 9 A comparison of stated goals broken down by ethnic groups.

Goal Statement	Percent Ethnic Group				Goal N	% GOAL
	Missing	Black	Hispanic	Anglo		
Improve job prospects	0	9	6	12	79	8.9
Learn better English	0	2	44	*	82	9.3
Obtain drivers license	0	*	4	0	10	1.1
Get diploma	100	71	40	70	576	65.2
Improve basis skills	0	14	6	17	117	13.2
<u>Other</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>*</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>2.3</u>
Ethnic Totals	= 10	446	165	263	884	100.0

* Indicates a response rate of less than 1%.

Table 10 The significant outcomes compared by ethnic group.

Significant Completions	Percent Ethnic Group				Completion Total	% Completions
	Missing	Black	Hispanic	Anglo		
Went on	5	9	9	1	40	6.7
Improved rating	67	36	49	42	251	41.8
No improvement rating	5	37	34	28	196	32.6
Passed G.E.D.	23	10	8	26	85	14.1
<u>Taken G.E.D.</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>*</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>4.8</u>
Ethnic Totals	= 21	290	134	156	601	100.0

* Indicates a response rate of less than 1%.

Comparison by Gender

Gender and Population

The second series of analyses consisted of comparisons of the dependent variables previously compared by ethnic group. The 1193 educational records collected for this project consisted of 946 males (393 black, 184 hispanic, 242 anglo and 127 ethnicity unknown) and 244 females (128 black, 8 hispanic, 56 anglo and 52 ethnicity unknown). The gender was not available for three of the students included in this project.

The proportions of the student population, prison population and county population were collected and tabulated for comparison by gender. (See table 11.) The results show that whereas women comprise 10% of the prison population they comprise 20% of the students. The three records with the gender unknown are not included in this analysis.

The gender distributions for ethnic group proportions, mean and standard deviations for age and special status proportions were compiled and tabulated for comparison. A Chi-square was performed on the gender distributions of the education center, the prison, and the county population. The results, $\chi^2 = 117.95$, $p < .01$, indicated a significant difference existed between the gender populations of the county, the prison, and the education center. (See table 12.)

The resulting distributions indicate a four to one ratio between males and females who enter the education program while in prison. In the special status category, 93% of the immigrants were male, all of the learning disabled or mental health/mental retardation were male and 78% of the other categories were male.

Table 11 Gender distribution of the education program, of the prison and the county. The county population includes only those individuals 15 years and older.

<u>Gender</u>	<u>Percent Students</u>	<u>Percent Prison Population</u>	<u>Percent County Population</u>
Male	80	90	47
Female	<u>20</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>53</u>
Gender Total=1190		489	183,828

Table 12 Distribution of the proportions of ethnic group, age, and special status of inmates by gender.

<u>Gender</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Percent Ethnic Group</u>			<u>Percent special Status</u>				
		<u>Black</u>	<u>Anglo</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Immi- grant</u>	<u>Learning disabled</u>	<u>mh/ or</u>	<u>Volun- teer</u>	<u>None</u>
Male	80	75	81	96	93	100	100	78	78
Female	<u>20</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>22</u>
Totals =1190		521	298	192	124	24	7	9	771

Formal Education Level and Entry Level

The years of formal education and the programs entry levels were tabulated by gender. (See table 13.)

Table 13 Gender distribution of the formal education levels and entry levels.

Gender	Years Formal Education			Entry Level Grade Percents				Gender Totals
	N	Mean	S.D.	ESL	0 - 4	5 - 8	9 - 12	
Male	844	9.9	1.7	12	15	39	33	812
Female	<u>224</u>	10.2	1.8	<u>*</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>182</u>
Student N= 1068				102	140	407	345	994

* indicates percentages lower than 1.

The results indicate that the mean years of formal education for both groups was greater than 9 years. However, when the results of the placement tests were given only 269 (33%) males and 76 (42%) of the females had achieved a score equal to the mean years of formal education.

A one-tailed t-test was conducted to determine whether the differences between the years of formal education were significant. The results $t(1066) = -2.11, P=.036$ indicated that the mean years of formal education for the females was significantly higher than that of the males.

Pre and Post Reading and Math Scores

The pre and post-WRAT scores for both reading and math were compared by gender. The numbers, means and standard deviations were compiled and tabulated. (See table 14.) Two-tailed t-tests were used to conduct the analysis.

Table 14 Numbers, means, and standard deviations of the pre and post WRAT scores by gender.

Gender	READING						MATH					
	PRE-READ			POST-READ			PRE-MATH			POST-MATH		
	N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.
Male	674	6.99	2.1	173	7.27	2.0	698	5.78	2.0	175	5.87	1.9
Female	212	7.10	2.0	55	7.14	2.0	216	5.51	1.6	56	5.37	1.7
Student N =	886			228			914			231		

The results indicate that none of the pre and post-WRAT comparisons by gender achieved significance at the 5% level. There was no significant difference between the scores of males and females.

Course Attendance and Completion Rates

The percent of students, means and standard deviations for the hourly attendance rates and the percentage of students in each of the categories for the program completion rates were compiled and tabulated by gender. (See table 15.)

Table 15 The numbers, means and standard deviations for the hourly attendance rates and the numbers and percents for program outcomes by gender.

Gender	Hourly Attendance Rates			Percent Course Outcomes			Gender Totals
	Number	Means	S.D.	Completed	Went on	Dropped	
Male	419	65.36	62.9	24	16	60	422
Female	105	44.37	43.5	12	19	69	107
Total N =	524			112	87	330	529

A Two-tailed t-test was conducted to compare the hourly attendance rates by gender. The results, $t(522) = 3.26$, $p < .01$, indicated a significant difference had occurred. The males had achieved a significantly higher mean hourly attendance rate.

Program Re-Entry

A "Crosstabs" procedure with a Chi-square statistic was conducted on the tabulated course outcome rates. The results, $\chi^2, D.F.(2) = 6.56$, $p < .05$. A significant difference had occurred between the expected frequencies of the course outcomes and the observed frequencies of the outcomes. The observed frequencies of the "dropped" category was significantly higher among females 69% to 60% for males. A Kendall's Tau-b indicates an error-reduction statistic of .085, $p < .05$.

The overall non-completion rate is 62%. Although this percentage appears to be quite high, 81 (61 males and 20 females) of the students have re-entered the program one or more times. Of this group 45% (28 males and 9 females) eventually complete the cycle, proceed on to a higher grade level and take and/or pass the GED.

Difference Between Pre and Post Scores

One-tailed paired t-tests were conducted across the mean differences for the pre and post-reading (see table 16) and the pre and post-math (see table 17) scores compiled and tabled by gender.

The results of the t-test indicated that the males significantly improved in both reading and math skills while the females did not.

Table 16 The number of students, mean difference, standard error, t-value, degrees of freedom, and the t-probability for the pre and post reading scores compared by gender.

<u>Gender</u>	<u>Number Students</u>	<u>(Difference) Mean</u>	<u>Standard Error</u>	<u>t Value</u>	<u>d.f.</u>	<u>t Prob</u>
Male	138	0.4601	0.116	-3.97	137	.001*
Female	52	0.0923	0.200	-0.46	51	.324

Gender N = 190

* indicates an achieved significance < .05

Table 17 The number of students, mean difference, standard error, t-value, degrees of freedom and the t-probability for the pre and post math scores compared by gender.

<u>Gender</u>	<u>Number Students</u>	<u>(Difference) Mean</u>	<u>Standard Error</u>	<u>t Value</u>	<u>d.f.</u>	<u>t Prob</u>
Male	145	0.2938	0.116	-2.54	145	.006*
Female	54	0.0226	0.131	-0.17	52	.432

Gender N = 199

* indicates an achieved significance < .05

Stated Goals and Outcomes

The stated goals were compiled and tabulated by gender. (See table 18.)

The gender analysis, like the ethnic group analysis, indicated that a greater percentage of students sought to gain their high-school diploma. The second most selected goal was to improve basic skills. The females selected the improvement goals including the completion of high-school in larger percentages than the males.

Table 18 A comparison of stated goals analyzed by gender.

Goal Statement	Percent Gender		Goal N	% GOAL
	Male	Female		
Improve job prospects	9	12	79	8.9
Learn better English	11	*	82	9.3
Obtain drivers license	1	0	10	1.1
Get diploma	64	70	576	65.2
Improve basis skills	13	15	117	13.2
<u>Other</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>2.3</u>
Gender N =	722	162	884	100.0

* Indicates a response rate of less than 1%.

The significant outcomes were tabulated by gender. (see table 19.)

The resulting percentages indicate, for both male and female, that the improved outcome was the largest. Although over 50% of both the males and females included in this study were seeking to gain their high-school diploma, only 15% of the males and 12% of the females had succeeded in passing the GED test. Another 5% of the males and 2% of the females had taken their GED, but the final result was missing from the agency's records.

A "Chi-square" was conducted to determine whether any significant differences existed in the significant completions between males and females. The results, χ^2 , D.F. (15) = 15.83, $p > .05$, indicate a significant difference was not found. Males and females were not significantly different in the categories of significant completions.

Table 19 The significant outcomes compared by gender.

Significant Completions	Percent Gender		Completion Total	% Completions
	Male	Female		
Went on	6	7	38	6
Improved	43	40	252	42
No improvement	31	39	196	33
Passed G.E.D	15	12	85	14
<u>Taken G.E.D.</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>5</u>
Student N	= 479	121	600	100

Comparison by Marital Status**Marital Status and Population**

The third series of analyses consisted of comparing the areas of investigation by marital status. To conduct these analyses, three categories of marital status were used: "single" - included those students who indicated that they were never married; "married" - included the students who indicated that they were married while they were in the education program; and "separated" - included the students who indicated that they were divorced, separated or widowed.

The single group consisted of 726 or 74% (414 black, 202 anglo and 110 hispanic) students - 600 males and 126 females. The married group was comprised of 133 or 14% (47 black, 40 anglo and 46 hispanic) students - 113 males and 20 females. The separated group was made up of 116 or 12% (48 black, 51 anglo and 17 hispanic) students - 79 males and 37 females.

The marital distribution of the county was compared directly with the distribution of the students. The overall prison marital distribution was assumed to be skewed, because unless specifically asked, many of the inmates list themselves as separated since they are not with their families. The same criticism may be made of those inmates enrolling for education. However, for those enrolling in the education program, the fact that accuracy is stressed when completing the form can be documented from personal observation. However, the same can not be said for the completion of the forms when incarceration occurs.

The marital status of the inmate population and the county population were collected and tabulated. (See table 20.)

The analyses of marital status does not include the records of 216 students. These records did not have the marital status completed.

The marital distribution indicated that while single people make up only 26% of the county's population, they comprise 74% of the inmate population enrolling in the education center.

The proportions of the student marital status by gender shows that both single males and females are over-represented in, at least the education program's population, if not the overall prison population as well.

Table 20 Marital distribution of the education program and the county.

(County population includes only those individuals 15 years and older.)

<u>Marital Status</u>	<u>Percent Students</u>	<u>Percent County Population</u>	<u>Student Percent</u>	
			<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
Single	74	26	76	69
Married	14	56	14	11
<u>Separated</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>20</u>
Student N = 977		183,828	794	183

Formal Education Level and Entry Level

The percentages of students, mean years and standard deviations of formal education and the percentages of students for the categories of entry level were compiled and tabulated by marital status. (See table 21.)

A One-way ANOVA was conducted on the mean years of formal education by marital status. The resulting $F(2,924) = .1431$, $p > .85$ indicated no significant difference had not been found when compared by the marital status of the students.

A "Crosstabs" procedure with a Chi-square statistic was performed to determine whether there was a difference in entry-level education by marital status. The results (χ^2 , d.f.(6) = 21.94, $p < .05$) showed a significant difference existed on the entry level education when compared by marital status.

The mean years from the formal education levels indicated an average of above the ninth grade for all levels of marital status. However, when the placement tests were given, the results seem to be equally distributed across the levels of marital status and entry levels. The formal education level was higher than the entry level.

Table 21 Marital status distribution of the formal education levels and entry levels.

<u>Marital Status</u>	<u>Years Formal Education</u>			<u>Entry Level Percents</u>				<u>Marital Totals</u>
	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>ESL</u>	<u>0 - 4</u>	<u>5 - 8</u>	<u>9 - 12</u>	
Single	686	9.9	1.6	9	13	44	34	697
Married	130	9.8	2.1	20	16	29	35	133
Separated	<u>111</u>	9.9	1.7	<u>11</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>109</u>
Totals = 927				97	129	387	326	939

Pre and Post Reading and Math Scores

The pre and post-reading and math scores were compared by the three types of marital status. The percentage of students, the means and the standard deviations were compiled and tabulated for statistical comparison. (See table 22.)

A One-way ANOVA was conducted to determine whether any significant differences were found in the pre and post-reading and math scores for the three marital status groups.

Table 22 Numbers, means, and standard deviations of the pre and post WRAT scores by marital status.

Marital Status	READING						MATH					
	PRE-READ			POST-READ			PRE-MATH			POST-MATH		
	N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.
Single	536	7.04	1.9	161	7.16	1.9	548	5.77	1.9	162	5.70	1.9
Married	92	6.84	2.6	17	6.66	2.9	94	5.83	2.0	18	5.96	2.2
Separated	79	7.14	2.3	13	7.13	1.9	79	6.16	2.2	14	6.21	2.2
Student N = 706				191			721			194		

The results of the ANOVA procedure indicate that no significant difference had occurred between the pre and post-scores when compared by marital status. The achieved significances are as follows:

PREREAD - F ratio = .4816, d.f.=(2,703), Fprob.=.6180, $p > .50$;

PREMATH - F ratio = 1.406, d.f.=(2,718), Fprob.=.2457, $p > .20$;

POSTREAD - F ratio = .5117, d.f.=(2,188), Fprob.=.6003, $p > .50$;

POSTMATH - F ratio = .6158, d.f.=(2,191), Fprob.=.5413, $p > .50$.

The marital status of the student was not significantly related to the pre and post-reading and math scores.

Course Attendance and Completion Rates

The hourly attendance rate N's, means and standard deviations were computed and tabled along with the percentages for the levels of the course completion rates by marital status. (See table 23.)

A One-way ANOVA was performed on the hourly attendance rates across the levels of marital status. The results ($F(2,517) = .8105, p > .44$) indicated that a significant difference did not exist in the hourly attendance rates for the three levels of marital status.

A Chi-square procedure was performed on the levels of course completion. The resulting ($\chi^2, d.f.(4) = 7.06170, p > .14$) indicated a significant difference had not been found. The expected number of students in each cell was not significantly different than the observed number of students in each cell.

Table 23 The numbers, means and standard deviations for the hourly attendance rates and the numbers and percentages for program outcomes by marital status.

Marital Status	Hourly Attendance Rates			Percent Course Outcomes			Marital Totals
	Number	Means	S.D.	Completed	Went on	Dropped	
Single	374	62.11	60.6	22	17	61	379
Married	78	64.35	57.7	18	21	61	76
Separated	68	52.86	60.1	16	9	75	69
Totals =	520			110	86	328	524

Program Re-Entry

The overall non-completion rate, when compared by marital status, for the students is 63%. Of this overall 63%, 46 of the non-completers (40 single, 3 married and 3 separated) re-entered the program one time. The course outcomes for the singles included 19 improved, 1 passed GED, 1 taken GED-test results were not in archived educational records, 1 went on, 17 no improvements and one with outcome unknown. The 3 married were documented as improved, while the one of the separated was improved the other two did not show any improvement.

Another thirty (24 single, 5 married and 1 separated) of the non-completers re-entered the program twice. The outcomes for the 24 single inmates included 6 improved, 1 went on, 16 showed no improvement and the outcome for one was missing. The outcomes for the five married included 1 improved, 3 showed no improvement and the data for one was missing. The one separated was shown to have improved.

The number of non-completers who re-entered the program three or more times included 4 single and 1 separated students. The outcomes for the 4 single students included 1 improved and 3 not improved. The separated student did not improve.

Overall 81 (25%) of the non-completers re-entered the program one or more times with 40% either improving, going on, taking the GED or passing the GED.

Difference Between Pre and Post Scores

One-tailed paired t-tests were used to compare the differences between the pre and post-reading and math scores for the levels of marital status. The results of the t-test for the mean differences between the pre and post-read scores are displayed on table 24.

The results of the t-test indicated that all three marital status groups had improved. However, only the single and separated groups were significantly improved in reading skills. The married group failed to improve at all. In fact their post-reading score was lower than their pre-reading score.

The results of the t-test for the mean differences between the pre and post - math scores (displayed on table 25) also indicate improvement for all three marital status groups. However, only the separated who had indicated that they were separated significantly improved in math.

Table 24 The number of students, mean difference, standard error, t-value, degrees of freedom, and the t-prob for the pre and post reading scores compared by marital status.

<u>Marital Status</u>	<u>Number Students</u>	<u>(Difference) Mean</u>	<u>Standard Error</u>	<u>t Value</u>	<u>d.f.</u>	<u>t Prob</u>
Single	140	0.2957	0.108	-2.73	139	.001*
Married	15	-0.6600	0.653	1.01	14	.165
<u>Separated</u>	<u>10</u>	0.2700	0.253	-1.86	9	.001*
Totals =	165					

* indicates an achieved significance < .05

Table 25 The number of students, mean difference, standard error, t-value, degrees of freedom, and the t-probability for the pre and post math scores compared by marital status.

<u>Marital Status</u>	<u>Number Students</u>	<u>(Difference) Mean</u>	<u>Standard Error</u>	<u>t Value</u>	<u>d.f.</u>	<u>t Prob</u>
Single	144	0.1514	0.112	-1.35	143	.089
Married	17	0.2529	0.276	-0.92	16	.186
<u>Separated</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>0.5600</u>	0.302	-1.86	9	.048*
Total =	171					

* indicates an achieved significance < .05

Stated Goals and Outcomes

The stated goals were compiled and tabulated by marital status. (See table 26.)

Again, the same two goals as the gender analysis and ethnic group analysis predominated: to gain a high-school diploma (65.2%) and to improve basic skills (11.5%).

Once again, the improved category was the largest and no improvement was the second largest group. Overall 66% of the 572 students (59% of the singles, 58% of the married and 61% of the separated) whose data were available for the marital status analysis had improved in some way - either by going on, showing improvement, passing the GED or taking the GED.

The significant outcomes were collected and tabulated by marital status. (see table 27.)

Table 26 A comparison of stated goals by marital status.

Goal Statement	Percent Marital Status			Goal N	Percent GOAL
	Single	Married	Separated		
Improve job prospects	9	8	11	79	9.1
Learn better English	8	15	11	81	9.4
Obtain drivers license	*	2	0	7	.8
Get diploma	69	52	58	563	65.2
Improve basis skills	11	18	19	117	13.6
Other	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>1.2</u>
Student Totals =	634	125	105	864	100.0

* Indicates a response rate of less than 1%.

Table 27 The significant outcomes compared by marital status.

Significant Completions	Percent Marital Status			Completion Total	Percent Completions
	Single	Married	Separated		
Went on	6	12	3	38	7
Improved	41	42	39	232	41
No improvement	32	33	46	195	34
Passed G.E.D.	15	11	12	79	14
Taken G.E.D.	<u>6</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>4</u>
Student totals =	420	82	70	572	100

Comparison by Referral Source

The final series of analyses consisted of comparing the source of referral to the areas of analysis. To accomplish this, the thirteen categories of referral listed on the "intake sheet" (see addenda Ia and Ib) were collapsed into seven. The collapsing occurred as follows: "peers"-other inmate students; "acquaintance" - relative or friend outside the prison; "work" - employer and union; "professional" - school counselor, rehabilitation counselor and clergy; "agencies" - local board of education, other institution personnel (warden) and human service agency; "media"-newspaper, radio, TV and handout, mailed leaflet and "other".

Referral by Population

A frequency distribution was conducted on the seven categories of referral source. The analysis resulted in several of the cells being too small for parametric analyses, therefore, an additional collapsing was performed. This collapsing reduced the categories of referral source to five. The "peers" category was not changed, "acquaintance" was combined with "work", the "professional" category remained the same, "agencies" and "media" were combined and "other" remained the same.

The frequencies of ethnic group and gender were compiled by the referral source, and the results were tabulated for comparison. (See table 28.)

Overall 334 of the students (39%) had been referred by professionals such as clergy or rehabilitation counselor. Not one student indicated an "other" referral source.

A Chi-square was performed to determine whether the referral source category differed significantly when compared by ethnic group. The results,

χ^2 , D.F. (9), = 11.08, $p > .05$, indicate that the referral sources were not significantly different when compared by the ethnicity of the student.

A Chi-square was conducted on the referral source categories by gender. The results, χ^2 , D.F. (3) = 7.60, $p > .05$, revealed no significant differences between the levels of referral source when compared by gender.

The analysis of the education population with the prison population and the county population was not performed for the referral source variable. This is because none of the inmates were referred to either the prison or the county.

Table 28 The percentages of ethnic group and gender by referral source.

<u>Referral Source</u>	<u>Percent Ethnic Group</u>			<u>Percent Gender</u>	
	<u>Black</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Anglo</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
Peers	21	25	23	21	29
Acquaintance	21	11	18	19	16
Professionals	36	46	39	40	32
<u>Agencies</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>23</u>
Student Totals =	439	158	263	705	158

Formal Education Level and Entry Level

The years of formal education and the education program's entry levels were collected and tabulated according to the student's referral source. (See table 29.)

An One-way ANOVA was performed to determine whether the mean differences of years of formal education were significant when compared by referral source. The results, $F(3,855) = 1.1987$, $p = .3092$, indicated a significant difference had not been found.

The entry levels were visually compared with the mean years of formal education. The overall mean years of formal education was 9.85 years while only 33% of the entry level placement test scores were above the ninth grade level.

Table 29 Referral status distribution of the formal education levels and entry levels.

Referral Source	Years Formal Education			Entry Level Percents			
	N	Mean	S.D.	ESL	0 - 4	5 - 8	9 - 12
Peers	198	9.9	1.8	35	20	23	20
Acquaintance	155	10.0	1.7	3	22	21	18
Professional	335	9.9	1.9	48	40	37	37
<u>Agency</u>	<u>171</u>	9.7	1.6	<u>14</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>25</u>
Student N =	859			92	126	356	286

Pre and Post Reading and Math Scores

The pre and post-reading and math scores were compared by referral source. (See table 30 for the numbers, means and standard deviations for the pre and post-reading and math scores.)

One-way ANOVA's were used to determine whether the pre and post-scores were significantly different when compared by who referred the student. The results indicated that a significant difference had occurred in only the post-math scores. However, when a Student-Newman-Keuls procedure was employed to probe the ANOVA, the results revealed that no two groups were significant at the 0.05 level. Therefore, the overall ANOVA results were significant and not any two groups specifically.

Although, the Student-Newman-Keuls procedure did not indicate any specific groupings, agency as a referral source group is the only one that does not show improvement between pre and post-scores.

Table 30 Numbers, means, and standard deviations of the pre and post WRAT scores by referral source.

Referral Source	READING						MATH					
	PRE-READ			POST-READ			PRE-MATH			POST-MATH		
	N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.
Peers	134	6.92	2.2	32	7.32	2.2	162	5.93	2.0	39	6.10	2.0
Acquaintance	128	7.24	2.0	32	7.31	2.0	123	5.95	2.2	30	6.35	2.1
Professional	223	6.84	2.1	54	7.03	1.8	253	5.69	1.8	61	5.52	1.6
<u>Agency</u>	<u>153</u>	7.20	2.0	<u>35</u>	6.37	1.8	<u>111</u>	5.98	1.8	<u>26</u>	5.10	1.9
Student N =	638			153			649			156		

The results of the ANOVA procedure indicate the following:

PREREAD - F ratio = 1.594, d.f.=(3,634), Fprob.=.1896, $p>.05$;

PREMATH - F ratio = .9597, d.f.=(3,645), Fprob.=.4113, $p>.05$;

POSTREAD -F ratio = 1.430, d.f.=(3,149), Fprob.=.2362, $p>.05$;

POSTMATH -F ratio = 2.898, d.f.=(3,152), Fprob.=.0370, $p<.05$.

Course Attendance and Completion Rates

The hourly attendance rates and the course completion rates were organized by referral source and tabled for comparison. (See table 31.)

An One-way ANOVA was performed of the hourly attendance rates and a Cross-tabulation on the course completion rates.

The results of the ANOVA, ($F(3,516) = 2.1535, p > .05$), indicated a significant difference had not been found. The hourly attendance rates were not significantly different when compared by who referred the student.

Program Re-Entry

The percentages from the crosstabs indicate that, as with the other course completion analyses, an overall non-completion rate of over 60%.

A deeper investigation into these non-completers indicate that over 60% of the re-entries were referred by peers or fellow inmates.

Table 31 The numbers, means, and standard deviations for the hourly attendance rates and the numbers and percentages for program outcomes by referral source.

Referral Source	Hourly Attendance Rates			Percent Course Outcomes		
	Numbers	Means	S.D.	Completed	Went on	Dropped
Peers	140	58.09	68.9	23	31	28
Acquaintance	57	46.16	39.2	12	12	10
Professionals	177	68.38	62.0	35	33	34
Agency	<u>146</u>	60.52	52.8	<u>30</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>28</u>
Student N =	520			110	84	328

Difference Between Pre and Post Scores

A One-tailed paired t-tests were used to compare the differences between the pre and post-reading and math scores for the levels of referral source. The results of the t-test for the mean differences between the pre and post-read scores are displayed on table 32.

The results of the One-tailed paired t-tests indicated that both the peers and professional referral sources were significantly improved in reading skills while the inmates referred by either an acquaintance or agency were not.

The results of the Paired One-tailed t-tests indicate that only the group of students referred by their fellow students were significantly improved. The group referred by human service agencies not only failed to significantly improve, they failed to improve at all; their post-results were poorer than their pre-scores.

The results of the t-test for the mean differences between the pre and post - math scores are displayed on table 33.

Table 32 The number of students, mean difference, standard error, t-value, degrees of freedom, and the t-probability for the pre and post-reading scores compared by referral source.

<u>Referral Source</u>	<u>Number Students</u>	<u>(Difference) Mean</u>	<u>Standard Error</u>	<u>t Value</u>	<u>d.f.</u>	<u>t Prob</u>
Peers	30	0.7667	0.317	-2.42	29	.011*
Acquaintance	26	0.0778	0.172	-0.45	26	.326
Professionals	49	0.4750	0.195	-2.43	47	.009*
<u>Agency</u>	<u>26</u>	-0.1192	0.296	0.40	25	.346
Totals =	131					

* indicates an achieved significance < .05

Table 33 The number of students, mean difference, standard error, t-value, degrees of freedom, and the t-probability for the pre and post-math scores compared by referral source.

<u>Referral Source</u>	<u>Number Students</u>	<u>(Difference) Mean</u>	<u>Standard Error</u>	<u>t Value</u>	<u>d.f.</u>	<u>t Prob</u>
Peers	32	0.2968	0.216	-1.37	30	.043*
Acquaintance	27	0.1893	0.351	-0.54	27	.297
Professional	50	0.1569	0.118	-1.33	50	.096
<u>Agency</u>	<u>27</u>	-0.1654	0.227	0.73	25	.237
Totals =	136					

* indicates an achieved significance < .05

Stated Goals and Outcomes

The percentage of stated goals were computed and tabled according to the students source of referral. (See table 34.)

The resulting percentages indicated that the obtaining of a high-school diploma as the most selected goal for all referral sources. Each referral source had over 60% in this category.

The final comparison of the referral source variable was the percentages of the types of program completions. The percentages of these completions were computed and tabled by the referral source levels.

The resulting percentages (the went-on, improved, and taking or passing the G.E.D.) indicated an overall successful completion rate of 65%. The percentage of students who were determined by the instructor as not showing any improvement was only 35%.

The comparison of the outcomes by the student's referral source appears to have reversed. In this analysis, significantly larger percentages of the students referred by acquaintances and agencies have passed the GED and obtained their high-school diploma, while in the previous analyses which were compared with the referral source, the students referred by peers and professionals consistently rose to the top. (See table 35.)

Table 34 A comparison of stated goals analyzed by referral source.

Goal Statement	Percent Referral Source				Goal N	% Goal
	Peers	Acquaintance	Professional	Agencies		
Improve job prospects	11	11	8	9	79	9.2
Learn better English	13	5	11	7	81	9.4
Obtain drivers license *	*	*	1	1	8	0.9
Get diploma	63	66	64	68	561	65.0
Improve basis skills	10	19	13	12	117	13.6
Other	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>2.0</u>
Student Totals =	194	157	334	178	863	100.0

* Indicates a response rate of less than 1%.

Table 35 The significant outcomes compared by referral source.

Significant Completions	Percent Referral Source				Completion Total	% Completion
	Peers	Acquaintance	Professional	Agency		
Went on	5	11	7	6	37	6.8
Improved	44	39	41	31	213	38.9
No improvement	35	32	35	37	193	35.2
Passed G.E.D.	10	15	13	19	77	14.1
Taken G.E.D.	<u>6</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>5.0</u>
Student N =	147	66	190	145	548	100.0

DISCUSSION

Comparisons by Ethnic Group

The results partially confirmed the first prediction, that the ethnic distribution of inmates seeking to improve their education while in prison was equal for the black group. This group represented 52% of the overall inmate population and 52% of the enrollees were black. The hispanic group, on the other hand represented only 9% of the overall prison population and 19% of the enrolled population. The anglo group represented 39% of the prison population and only 29% of the student population. The percentage of hispanics enrolling in the education program is more than twice the percentage of hispanics in the prison, significantly higher than expected by chance.

The results did support the prediction that the minority groups are over-represented in prison in that blacks comprise 13% and hispanic 2% of the county's population whereas the prison population comprises 52% black and 9% hispanic. A total minority group population of 61%. This outcome compares well with the estimates of an overall minority incarceration rate of 60% (Darling & Paul, 1985).

The prediction that the minority groups, in particular, the black group, would have a lower formal education level than the other ethnic groups was not supported by the results. In fact, the black ethnic group had a significantly higher formal education level than either the anglo or hispanic groups. This result suggests that blacks are incarcerated with higher formal education levels than whites and hispanics. This may reflect a Judicial

System prejudice, or a social system prejudice, or a bias in the labor market. This issue calls for future research.

When the formal education level was compared with the program's entry level, a difference was noted. In the formal education level, 712 (85%) of the students had indicated a level in grades 9 through 12, yet only 345 (38%) achieved a placement score equal to the same grade levels.

When the pre-measures or placement scores were compared by ethnic group, the pre-read outcome was somewhat as predicted. The hispanic group scored significantly lower than the other groups. This is probably due, in large part, to the basic language and individual letter inflection and pronunciation. The anglo group's mean score was significantly higher than the other groups.

The pre-math scores when compared by ethnic group indicated the same results as the pre-reading scores. The anglo group's pre-math mean was significantly higher than the other three groups. The black and the missing groups were significantly higher than the hispanic group while no significant difference occurred between these two groups.

The post-reading results failed in-part to support the prediction that the minority groups would be lower than the anglo group. Only the hispanic group's post-read was significantly lower than the anglo group.

The post-math results also failed to support the prediction. Only the hispanic and missing group's scores were significantly lower than the anglo group. The scores of the black group were also significantly higher than the hispanic and missing groups.

The prediction that the minority groups would be lower than the anglo group in attendance and program completion rates was not supported by the results. The results do indicate that although the hispanic group is significantly lower in both the pre and post measures, the hispanic group had a significantly higher attendance rate than the other ethnic groups. The program completion rates, however, indicated an approximately equal percentages of completers (completed and went on) and non-completers.

The prediction that the inmates who re-enter the program one or more times will eventually complete was not supported by the results. Only 45% of those inmates re-entering the program eventually complete. The ethnic distribution of those inmates re-entering the program (black 61%, hispanic 22% and anglo 17%) does not appear to be equal to either the overall non-completion rate (black 63%, hispanic 64% and anglo 61%) or the overall inmate populations (black 52%, hispanic 19% and anglo 29%). Only the black group appears to re-enter the program at a rate relatively close to their non-completion rate. Since the non-completion rate includes those inmates released on bail before sentencing, a possible cause of this result may be that more blacks may be sentenced to serve time while the other ethnic groups may be paroled.

The comparison of the pre-results with the post-results are entirely consistent with the prediction. That is, all ethnic groups showed improvement, but only the anglo group showed significant improvement on both the reading and math comparisons.

The prediction that the student's stated goal will affect the final program outcome was not supported by the results. Although 65% of 884

students indicated that their goal was to obtain their high-school diploma, only 14% of 601 students had achieved this goal by passing the GED. An additional 4.8% of 601 students had taken the GED but the results were not obtainable from the center's records.

Comparison by Gender

The prediction for the series of gender analysis was that no significant difference would be found. This prediction was accurate for all of the analyses except the gender distributions (education center, prison and county), formal education, attendance rates, course completion rates and the measures of improvement in both reading and math.

The gender distributions indicated a disproportionate representation of males in the prison population as opposed to the county's population. The education center's distribution, on the other hand, indicated that the females represented a larger proportion than in the prison population.

The formal education levels did not support the prediction of no difference. The mean formal education level for the females of 10.2 years was significantly higher than the males' mean of 9.9 years. This significant result was not entirely unanticipated.

The attendance rate result was unanticipated. Although the females had significantly higher formal education levels, they were significantly lower in hourly attendance rates. The course completion rates were also surprising. Significantly more males were observed in both (completed and went on) categories than were expected.

The comparisons between the pre and post-measures for reading and math showed that only males significantly improved. The tests of the pre-scores

were not significantly different. Neither, were the post-scores, however, when the difference between the scores was computed, the resulting mean differences were significantly different.

Comparison by Marital Status

The series of analyses, the comparisons of the educational records controlling for the marital status of the students, failed to entirely support the notion that the married inmates would be significantly higher in the pre and post-comparisons and the outcomes.

The analysis of the marital status distribution of the education center and the county indicated the largest percentage (74%) of the student population was single, while only 26% of the county's population was single. The married proportion of the students was only 14% while that for the county was 56%. The initial prediction may somewhat be supported by the marital distribution analysis. The notion that married individuals would in some way do better than the other groups might be supported by the notion that less married individuals are incarcerated in the first place.

The tests of significance for formal education levels and program entry levels indicated that no difference had been found. These results do not support the prediction. The married group did not have a significantly higher formal education level. Nor, did the married group place higher in the entry levels than the other groups.

The results of the pre and post-reading and math scores also failed to support the prediction. The married group failed to out-perform the other two groups.

The tests for hourly attendance rates and course completion rates do

offer a hint that the married students do slightly better. The differences in the hourly attendance rates for the marital status groups was not significant. The statistical comparison for the course completion rates failed to indicate a significant difference, however, the married group did achieve a lower percent (14%) of non-completers than the single (70%) and the separated (16%).

The results of the comparison of the pre and post-reading and math failed to support the prediction. The only group who failed to significantly improve was the married group. The other two groups (single and separated) significantly improved in reading and the separated group significantly improved in math.

The analyses of the stated goal and significant completion did not support the prediction. The married group was the lowest group whose goal was to gain their high-school diploma and it was the lowest in taking or passing the GED.

Comparison by Referral Source

The prediction for the final series of analyses (the referral source variable) was that the more formal the referrer, the better the student would do. This prediction was in some ways supported and in other ways not supported. The formal ordering of the referral sources was professional as the most formal, agencies just below professional, acquaintances just below agencies and peers the least formal.

The distribution of the student population did indicate that the larger number of students had been referred by professionals. The agencies group did not fare as well, only 13% of the students had been referred by an

agency. The remaining groups did better, the acquaintances group consisted of 17% of the students, while the peers group equaled 16%.

The comparison of the years of formal education and the program's entry level failed to support the prediction. The years of formal education were not significantly different regardless of who referred the student. The professional group, however, does represent the larger percentage of students in the four categories of entry level: ESL 48%, 0 - 4 40%, 5 - 8 37% and 9-12 37%.

The significant difference that occurred when the pre and post-reading and math scores were compared by referral source were the post-math scores. The Student - Newman - Keuls probe indicated that no two groups were significantly different at the .05 level. Therefore, although significance did occur, the prediction was not supportable because the location of the significance was not determinable.

The comparison of the hourly attendance rates and the course completion rates also failed to support the prediction. None of the groups was significantly different in the hours of attendance. Again the professionals group had the larger percentage of students, including the non-completers, in the three categories of course completion: completed 35%, went on 33% and dropped 34%.

The comparisons of the pre and post-measures partly supported the prediction. The results of the statistical analysis indicated that both the peer and professional referral sources were significantly improved. The significant reading improvements occurred for both peers and professionals with the peers achieving the largest degree of improvement. The math, on the

other hand, indicated that only the peers group significantly improved. This result may in some way indicate that peer referral or pressure in prison may have a positive outcome.

The results of the goal statement and significant completion analyses partly failed to support the prediction. Although the agencies group failed to achieve significant results throughout this series of analyses, this group did represent the largest percentage of students whose stated goal was to obtain their high-school diploma. This group also represented the largest percentage of students either taking and passing the GED.

SUMMARY

The results of this research are not entirely inconsistent with the findings of the literature previously cited. (See page 1 and 2.) Although the previously cited findings concern the prison population in general, the results of this project lend support to the profile of developed by Bell et al. (1984).

The goals of this project were not only to examine the population of a local county prison but the population of those inmates who enrolled in the education center as well. From the findings of this project, a profile of inmates who enrolled in the education of the county prison may be compiled.

The results indicate that the next inmate who will enroll have the following probabilities:

1. A 61% chance of being from a minority (52% black and 9% hispanic).
2. A four-to-one chance of being male (males 80% and females 20%).
3. A 74% chance of being single, a 14% chance of being married and a 12% chance of being separated, widowed or divorced.
4. A 23% chance of being referred by a fellow inmate who is enrolled; a 17% chance of being referred by friends, relatives, someone from work or a union representative; a 39% chance of being referred by a clergyman, school counselor or rehabilitation counselor and 13% chance of being referred by a human services agency, other prison personnel, media, and so on.

Once the inmate has enrolled, it will be determined that:

1. The student will have an average 9.9 years of formal education.
2. The student will have a 35% chance of scoring less on the education center's placement tests than the student's formal education level.
3. Average a grade level of 7.0 on reading tests and a level of 5.7 on math.
4. After the course is completed, the student can expect an average grade level of 7.2 on reading and 5.8 on math tests.
5. The student will have an overall hourly attendance rate of 61 hours.
6. The student will have over a 60% chance of not being able to complete the program for whatever reason.
7. The student will have a 25% chance of re-entering the program one or more times and an overall chance of 45% of achieving a successful outcome during one of these re-entries.
8. The student will have a 67% chance of significantly improving in reading.
9. The student will have a 21% chance of improving in math.
10. The student will have a 50% chance of seeking to obtain a high-school diploma.
11. The student will have an 19% chance of either taking or passing the GED.

In answer to the initial question of this project regarding the effectiveness of corrections education, one must conclude the answer is yes, the results indicate that for the most part the educational goals are being met. However, several looming questions remain: Do educational programs make

a difference in the inmate's future? Do such programs affect recidivism rates?

One of the problems discussed earlier concerned the possibility undereducated inmates becoming more violent in subsequent crimes. Boudouris & Turnball (1985) and Walsh (1985) reported that the use of educational programs not only reduce the recidivism rates, but if another crime is committed the violence level is significantly decreased.

REFERENCES

- Angle, T. The Development of Educational Programs in American Adult Prisons and Juvenile Reformatories During the Nineteenth Century. Journal of Correctional Education, 33, 4-7.
- Bell, R., Conrad, E.H., & Suppa, R.J. (1984). The Findings and Recommendations of the National Study on Learning Deficiencies in Adult Inmates. Journal of Correctional Education, 35, 129-137.
- Boudouris, J & Turnbull, B. (1985). Shock Probation in Iowa. Journal of Offender Counseling, Services & Rehabilitation, 9, 53-67.
- Bush, B. quoted by Wellborn, S. (1982). Ahead: A Nation of Illiterates. U.S. News and World Report, May, 53-64.
- Clemmer, D. (1940). The Prison Community. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Darling, S. & Paull, S. (1985). Reading Means Freedom: Experiences of a National ABE Program. Journal of Correctional Education, 36, 55-58.
- Gehring, T. (1982). Zebulon Brockway of Elmira: 19th Century CE Hero. Journal of Correctional Education, 33, 4-7.
- Gehring, T. & Muth, W. (1985). The Correctional Education/Prison Reform Link: Part I, 1840-1900. Journal of Correctional Education, 36, 140-146.
- Goldin, C. & Thomas, J. (1984). Adult Education in Correctional Settings: Symbol or Substance? Adult Education Quarterly, 34, 123-134.
- Homant, R. T. (1985). Employment of Ex-Offenders: The Role of Prisonization and Self-Esteem. Journal of Offender Counseling, Services & Rehabilitation, 8, 5-23.
- Kelly, M. (1989). Per telephone conversation with Marita Kelly 05/16/89.

- Muth, W. R. & Gehring, T. (1986). The Correctional Education/Prison Reform Link: 1913- 1940 and Conclusion. Journal of Correctional Education, 37, 14-17.
- Pennsylvania State Data Center. (1980). Census of Population and Housing. Summary Tape File 3A, 22.
- Roberts, L. A. (1984). Bridewell: The World's First Attempt at Prisoner Rehabilitation Through Education. Journal of Correctional Education, 35, 83-84.
- Roberts, L. A. (1985). The Historic Roots of American Prison Reform: A Story of Progress and Failure. Journal of Correctional Education, 36, 107-109.
- Skalka, P., (1989). No One's Born a Loser. Reader's Digest, February, 21-22.
- SPSSX User's Guide, (1986). 2nd Edition. Chicago: McGraw-Hill.
- Walsh, A. (1985). An Evaluation of the Effects of Adult Basic Education on Rearrest Rates Among Probationers. Journal of Offender Counseling, Services & Rehabilitation, 9, 69-76.

Addendum Ia: Page 1 Instructions Student Intake Form

INSTRUCTIONS: 1981-82 STUDENT INTAKE/DATA FORM

The Student Intake/Data Forms are designed: (1) to provide you with useful program control information and (2) to provide the state office with required data for federal reporting forms.

In filling out these forms, you are making four copies. A ball point pen makes the best handwritten copies. PLEASE PRESS DOWN FIRMLY.

The instructions below are numbered to correspond to the item numbers on the Student Intake/Data Form. Instructions are given only for those items requiring clarification. Should you have any questions about these forms, or need additional forms, please call Grace Lavery or John Cina at 717/787-4960 (Bureau of Research and Evaluation, Pennsylvania Department of Education).

PROGRAM NUMBER

The number for this program, identified in the Program Data Form, should be printed in the upper right corner of the Student Form.

I. SECTION ONE: STUDENT DETAILS INFORMATION

- 1-5. Name and address information is to help you keep your own records. If case number or other designation is more useful to you, please use it. In this part the state needs only one piece of information about the student: county of residence and social security number. If county of residence is not otherwise available, please fill in the county where the class is located. If student has no social security number or refuses to divulge it, mark NA (not available) in that space, but make an effort to obtain it before giving up.

7. AGE - State age at time of first class attended during the fiscal year. If student refuses to give age, teacher or counselor may give his/her best estimate.

8. RACE - Select one category from the list below and enter the corresponding digit in the available space. Conform as closely as possible to the federal definitions listed below. However, a student may be included in the group to which he/she appears to belong or with which he/she identifies.

SELECT ONLY ONE CATEGORY.

- 1 - American Indian or Alaskan Native - A person having origins in any of the original people of North America. This category includes American Indians, Eskimos, and Aleuts.
- 2 - Asian or Pacific Islander - A person having origins in any of the original people of the Far East, Southeast Asia, the Indian subcontinent, or the Pacific Islands. This area includes, for example, China, India, Japan, Korea, the Philippine Islands, and Samoa.
- 3 - Black - A person having origins in any of the Black racial groups of Africa. Do not include persons of Hispanic origin.
- 4 - Hispanic - A person of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race.
- 5 - White - A person having origins in any of the original people of Europe, North Africa, or the Middle East. Do not include persons of Hispanic origin.

10. Month and year of enrollment - Give month and year student entered this program.

11. Initial Entry Level - Check student's primary level of instruction at the start of this program, based on English language or reading level. Level of instruction must agree with program number. All programs (34- and 36- program numbers) include levels 0-4 or APL 1, 5-8 or APL 2, and ELL. CDD programs (35- and 37- program numbers) require level 9-12 only. Base this on actual functioning level, not on previous experience, schooling, or student's wish for a higher level.

12. Previous AGE - Please respond only if entry level is 9-12; otherwise leave blank.

13. a. Public assistance includes various forms of welfare (federal, state or local) but not unemployment compensation.

- b. For the purpose of this report the following federal definitions should be used:

Employed - Persons who did any work at all as paid employees or in their own business or profession, or on their own farms or who worked 15 hours or more as unpaid workers on a farm or in a business operated by a member of the family. Include those who were not working but who had jobs or businesses from which they were temporarily absent.

Unemployed (Available for work) - Persons who had no employment but were available for work and had engaged in any specific jobseeking activity or were waiting to be called back to a job from which they had been laid off.

Unemployed (Not available for labor force) - Persons who had no employment and did not engage in jobseeking activities in the calendar year preceding this report period and who were not employed and were not actively seeking work upon entrance into the program.

- c. Handicapped - Persons with any type of physical or mental disability that substantially impairs or restricts one or more major life activities including walking, seeing, hearing, speaking, working, learning. This definition includes adults who are alcohol and drug abusers, mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed, orthopedically impaired, adults with exceptional learning disabilities and other health impairments.

- d. Immigrant - Any refugee admitted (paroled) into this country or any alien except one who is exempt under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended.

14. Location of student's classes - Select one location from the list below and enter corresponding two-digit number in available space on form. If student attends classes in two different locations in this same program, write in both locations and include explanation.

- 11 - Elementary school - public or private.
- 12 - Junior high/secondary school - public or private.
- 20 - Learning center - settings featuring extensive use of programmed instruction, flexible participant scheduling and attendance, and open for extended period of time daily.
- 30 - State or federal correctional institution - include inmates only.
- 40 - County prison - include inmates only.
- 51 - Hospital - federal, state or local; include in-patients and out-patients only; include mental institutions.

- 52 - State or local institution for the handicapped - public or private; include day or residential schools serving physically/mentally handicapped adults age sixteen or older.
- 60 - Voc-tech school - public or private.
- 70 - Business or work site - operating places of employment for participants.
- 80 - Community center - church, library, outreach center, YW/TWCA, etc.
- 91 - Community or junior college.
- 09 - Other (specify on form).

15. Grade - Indicate the last one student completed, not the one he was in when he/she left school.

16. & 17. Please select only one option for each of these items. See the NOTE pages.

II. SECTION TWO: COMPLETION AND IMPACT DATA

Note: Please remove carbon before completing this page.

18. & 19. Contact hours are essential. Please round to nearest hour.

20. COMPLETION AND EARLY SEPARATION DATA

COMPLETION - Check all levels passed during or by the end of this program. A student passes by fulfilling the course requirements established by the local program, not, in the case of 9-12, by later success in the GED test. If a student leaves a course early because he/she has fulfilled the course requirements before the program ends, consider that student a PASS and not on EARLY SEPARATION.

CONTINUATION - If level at end of program is the same as at beginning, that student is a CONTINUATION. The student has participated throughout the program, has fulfilled assignments, but has not progressed to the next level or cannot be considered a PASS (or COMPLETION).

EARLY SEPARATION - Students who drop out of a level without completing the course level requirements. A student may separate early because he/she has met a personal objective, such as reviewing for College Boards. This student is still considered an EARLY SEPARATION if he/she did not actually fulfill the course level requirements (did not PASS). In this case, the primary reason for EARLY SEPARATION is a positive one, namely, "met personal objective".

Again, for Level 9-12, passing is not contingent upon passing the GED test. If a student fulfills the course requirements, either during or at the end of the program, consider the student a PASS even if that student later does not pass the GED test.

Example One: This student entered and completed the Level 0-4 requirements before the program ended. During this same program, this student entered Level 5-8, but by December, when the program ended, she had not completed the requirements for 5-8. For this report, the student COMPLETED Level 0-4 but neither COMPLETED nor SEPARATED EARLY from Level 5-8. (See table below.) The student's initial entry level (0-4) should already be checked in item 11.

COMPLETION AND EARLY SEPARATION DATA				
	LEVEL I			LEVEL II
	ESL	APL 1 or 0-4	APL 2 or 5-8	9-12
A. COMPLETION Check if student <u>PASSED</u> this level during this program.	☐	☒	☐	☐
B. CONTINUATION Check if student attended classes throughout this program and remains at the same level.	☐	☐	☐	☐
C. EARLY SEPARATION Check if student <u>SEPARATED EARLY</u> from this level, <u>without</u> completing course requirements.	☐	☐	☐	☐

Example Two: This student entered an ESL class, as shown in item 11. As a beginning English student he has worked hard, but is not yet fluent in English. He needs and intends to continue when class opens again. He is, therefore, checked as an ESL CONTINUATION.

COMPLETION AND EARLY SEPARATION DATA				
	LEVEL I			LEVEL II
	ESL	APL 1 or 0-4	APL 2 or 5-8	9-12
A. COMPLETION Check if student <u>PASSED</u> this level during this program.	☐	☐	☐	☐
B. CONTINUATION Check if student attended classes throughout this program and remains at the same level.	☒	☐	☐	☐
C. EARLY SEPARATION Check if student <u>SEPARATED EARLY</u> from this level, <u>without</u> completing course requirements.	☐	☐	☐	☐

21. **Primary reason for EARLY SEPARATION** - Select one and enter the corresponding 2-digit number in available space. If more than one reason applies, select the MOST IMPORTANT reason. If reason is unknown to you, enter "16".

- | | |
|--|---|
| 01 - To take a job (unemployed when entered program) | 08 - Transportation problem |
| 02 - To take a better job (employed when entered program) | 09 - Child care problem |
| 03 - Released from institution or transferred to another institution | 10 - Family problem |
| 04 - To enter another training program | 11 - Time class/program is scheduled |
| 05 - Met personal objective | 12 - Location of class |
| 06 - Moved from the area | 13 - Lack of interest; instruction not helpful to participant |
| 07 - Health problem | 14 - Financial problem |
| | 15 - Other reason (specify on form) |
| | 16 - Information unavailable |

22. **Impact Data** - Multiple answers possible - please check all important student achievements in any of these areas. (Note: The Change of Status form includes the same Impact/Achievement items. If you find out later in the year that students have achieved more as a result of this program, please complete and send to us so we may update the Impact data.)

Addendum IIB: Reverse Side Page 2 Student Intake Sheet-For Instructor.

SECTION TWO: COMPLETIONS AND IMPACT DATA (to be filled out at end of student's program)

STOP!

BE SURE TO REMOVE CARBONS BEFORE COMPLETING THIS PAGE!

THANK YOU.

18. How many hours of instruction did this student receive during this program? (18-20)

19. Other contact hours (counseling, etc.) (21-27)

COMPLETION AND EARLY SEPARATION DATA

20. For the entry level (ESL, 0-4, 5-8, or 9-12) indicated in Item 11, Copy One, check one of the following:

- (28)
- 1 ☐ Completion. Student passed the entry level.
 - 2 ☐ Continuation. Student attended classes throughout the program but didn't complete entry level.
 - 3 ☐ Early Separation. Student didn't complete entry level and left before end of program.

21. EARLY SEPARATIONS: If "Early Separation" is checked above, please indicate the primary reason for the student's early separation from this level. (Consult instructions section and enter one 2-digit number. NOTE: If a student PASSES a level, that student is NOT an early separation, even if he/she leaves before the program ends.)

(29-30)
If 15, please specify: _____

22. Circle the number of Grade Levels or ESL levels the student advanced.

(31)
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

23. IMPACT DATA: ACHIEVEMENT OF PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

Educational

- (32) ☐ Improved basic skills for personal satisfaction and increased self-confidence.
- (33) ☐ Completed Level I (0-8) or its equivalent.
- (34) ☐ Completed Beginning ESL.
- (35) ☐ Completed Intermediate ESL.
- (36) ☐ Completed Advanced ESL.
- (37) ☐ Was Level I (0-8 and ESL) and improved, reading, writing, and math skills.
- (38) ☐ Obtained an adult high school diploma.
- (39) ☐ Passed the GED test.
- (40) ☐ GED test taken; results not received.
- (41) ☐ Learned the English language (for participants whose primary language is not English).
- (42) ☐ Entered another education/training program.

Societal

- (43) ☐ Received U.S. Citizenship.
- (44) ☐ Voted for first time.
- (45) ☐ Received driver's license as a result of program.
- (46) ☐ Referred to agencies (other than educational) for needed services.

Economic

- (47) ☐ Obtained a job.
- (48) ☐ Obtained a better job or salary.
- (49) ☐ Was removed from public assistance.
- (50) ☐ Met personal objective (specify) _____
- (51) ☐ None of the above apply.

COMPLETED BY _____
(initials)

Addendum IIC: Page 3 Student Intake Sheet-for student and instructor.

(01-05)

19115

PDE #008 (0-00)

PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
ADULT BASIC EDUCATION

STUDENT INTAKE/DATA FORM

Case No. _____

COPY FOUR - RETURN ONLY FOR CHANGES OR IF
ADDITIONAL IMPACT INFORMATION BECOMES AVAILABLE(06-11)
Program No. _____
(12)
Program Year 88-89It is essential to read the accompanying instructions before completing any part of this form.

Please complete all of Section One for each individual who has/she first enrolls in this program. As soon as Section One is completed, detach Copy One of this form and mail to Pennsylvania Department of Education, Division of Adult Basic Education, 333 Market St., Harrisburg, Pa. 17139-0533.

Complete Section Two at the end of the program or as soon as you know that the student has left the program. Then submit Copy Two of each form to the Division of Adult Basic Education. Retain Copy Three of each form for your records.

Copy Four is a Change in Status form. See instructions for use.

The Program Number, identified on the Program Data Form, must be entered on every form.

SECTION ONE: STUDENT INTAKE INFORMATION

(13-21)

1. Name _____ 2. Social Security Number _____

3. Permanent Home Address: Number & Street _____

City _____ Zip Code _____ Telephone _____ 4a. County _____

4b. Student's place of residence (see instructions): (03) ☐ 1. Rural ☐ 2. Urban/LSA ☐ 3. Urban/non LSA ☐ 4. Other

5. Please give name of person other than student's immediate family who will know where student is living should he/she move from present address.

Name _____ Address or Phone: _____

6. Sex (25) ☐ 1. Male ☐ 2. Female

7. Age _____ (26-27)

8. Race (see instructions) _____ (28)

9a. Marital Status (29) ☐ 1. Single ☐ 2. Married ☐ 3. Separated/Divorced ☐ 4. Widow/Widower

9b. Number of Dependents Under 18 _____

10. Month and year of enrollment in this program: _____ (32-35)
MO. _____ YR. _____11. Student's initial entry level in this program. ☐ 1. Beginning ESL ☐ 2. Intermediate ESL ☐ 3. Advanced ESL
Check one level only (See instructions): (36) ☐ 4. 0-4 ☐ 5. 5-8 ☐ 6. 9-1212. If entry level is 9-12, did student complete an ABE program through 8th grade? (37) ☐ 1. yes ☐ 2. no

13. At time of enrollment student is: (check ALL that apply-see instructions)

(38) ☐ 1. employed(39) ☐ handicapped(40) ☐ institutionalized☐ 2. unemployed/available for work(41) ☐ an immigrant(42) ☐ homeless adult☐ 3. unemployed/not available for work(43) ☐ receiving public assistance(44) ☐ limited in English proficiency(45) ☐ enrolled in other Federal Program(s)

23. IMPACT DATA: ACHIEVEMENT OF PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

Educational

- (46) ☐ Improved basic skills for personal satisfaction and increased self-confidence.
 (47) ☐ Completed Level I (0-8) or its equivalent.
 (48) ☐ Completed Beginning ESL.
 (49) ☐ Completed Intermediate ESL.
 (50) ☐ Completed Advanced ESL.
 (51) ☐ Was Level I (0-8 and ESL) and improved, reading, writing, and math skills.
 (52) ☐ Obtained an adult high school diploma.
 (53) ☐ Passed the GED test.
 (54) ☐ GED test taken; results not received.
 (55) ☐ Learned the English language (for participants whose primary language is not English).
 (56) ☐ Entered another education/training program.

Social

- (57) ☐ Received U.S. Citizenship.
 (58) ☐ Voted for first time.
 (59) ☐ Received driver's license as a result of program.
 (60) ☐ Referred to agencies (other than educational) for needed services.

Economic

- (61) ☐ Obtained a job.
 (62) ☐ Obtained a better job or salary.
 (63) ☐ Was removed from public assistance.
 (64) ☐ Met personal objective (specify) _____
 (65) ☐ None of the above apply.

Other Additions or Corrections

Item Number	Previous Entry	Corrected Entry